

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of January 3, 2008, claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,545,653 B1 (hereinafter “Takahara et al.”). In addition, claims 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahara et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,253,091 (hereinafter “Kimura et al.”). Furthermore, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahara et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,806,862 B1 (hereinafter “Zhang et al.”).

In response, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Takahara et al., as explained below. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the independent claims 1 and 11, as well as their dependent claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 12-17, be allowed.

A. Patentability of Independent Claims 1 and 11

The independent claim 1 recites in part “*some of the control lines being connected to a plurality of delay units such that only every other control line is connected to a particular delay unit, the delay units being used to store row voltage values for the control lines connected to the delay units until a clock signal is supplied to the delay units,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Takahara et al. Thus, the independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Takahara et al.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Office Action on page 3 asserts that the cited reference of Takahara et al. discloses “some of the control lines (i.e., X1-Xn) being connected to a plurality of delay units (i.e., plurality of D flip-flop 94 is connected to 98) such that only every other control lines (e.g. X1, X3) is connected to a particular delay unit (i.e. respective

D flip flop, which is showed in Fig. 4).” The cited reference of Takahara et al. does disclose a plurality of D flip-flops 94 in a gate driver 38, which is shown in Fig. 4, connected to the odd-numbered gate lines, e.g., gate lines x_1 and x_3 . However, Fig. 4 of Takahara et al. shows only one of the two gate drivers 38a and 38b. As described
5 in column 11, lines 46-52, of Takahara et al., the gate drivers 38a and 38b “are identical on arrangement and function to each other” but “the first gate driver 38a is connected to odd-numbered gate lines of the LCD panel 81” and “the second gate driver 38b is connected to even-numbered gate lines of the LCD panel 81.” Thus, if the gate driver shown in Fig. 4 of Takahara et al. is the first gate driver 38a, the D
10 flip-flops 94 are connected to the odd-numbered gate lines. However, the even-numbered gate lines would be connected to similar D flip-flops of the second gate driver 38b. Thus, the cited reference of Takahara et al. does not disclose the limitation of “*only every other control line is connected to a particular delay unit,*” as recited in the independent claim 1. Consequently, the independent claim 1 is not
15 anticipated by the cited reference of Takahara et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the independent claim 11, which recites similar limitations as the independent claim 1 with respect to data lines. In
20 particular, the independent claim 11 recites in part “*some of the data lines being connected to a plurality of delay units such that only every other data line is connected to a particular delay unit,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Takahara et al. As shown in Fig. 11 of Takahara et al., the odd-numbered source lines y_1, y_3, \dots are connected to the top source driver 33a and the even-numbered source
25 lines y_2, y_4, \dots are connected to the bottom source driver 33b. Thus, the cited reference of Takahara et al. does not disclose the limitation of “*only every other data line is connected to a particular delay unit,*” as recited in the independent claim 11. Consequently, the independent claim 11 is also not anticipated by the cited reference of Takahara et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the independent claim
30 11 be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 12-17

Each of the dependent claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 12-17 depends on one of the independent claims 1 and 11. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Kieschnick et al.

Date: March 3, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300